



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/025,121

12/18/2001

Daijiro Murata

16869S-040200US

3817

20350

7590

07/10/2008

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP  
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER  
EIGHTH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

CHOI, PETER H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3623

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/10/2008

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Docket@Townsend.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/025,121	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MURATA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> PETER CHOI	<b>Art Unit</b> 3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,9,12 and 14-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,9,12 and 14-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on April 3, 2008 has been entered.

2. The following is a **NON-FINAL** office action upon examination of application number 10/025,121. Currently, claims 1, 3, 9, 12 and 14-16 are pending.

### ***Response to Amendment***

3. Claims 1, 3 and 9 have been amended in the submission filed on April 3, 2008. Claims 15 and 16 have been added. Claims 4-8 and 10 were previously canceled, and claims 2, 11, and 13 are canceled herein.

4. The previous rejection of the claims raised under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph are withdrawn in view of amendments to claims 1 and 9 in the submission filed April 3, 2008.

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed April 3, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Stevens discusses a user inputting tasks to fill a project instead of copying selected works to define which works compose the project.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner asserts that the “selection” process requires a modicum amount of user input, as the selection is performed by a user, as evident by the claim limitation language of “selecting works by a user” (emphasis added), and not automated or automatically selected since there are no programming logic or rules governing the selection process. Further, the Examiner asserts that a user of the Stevens system may “copy” an instance of the project management structure framework that can organize project elements into as many as 12 levels of work breakdown structure and 128 levels of resources.

Applicant argues that Stevens discusses relating people and material resource to individual tasks within a project, but not relating different tasks to each other within a project.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Although Stevens does indeed relate people and material resources to tasks within a project, Stevens also relates different tasks within a project to one another using PERT and Gantt charts, in which task

sequencing can be displayed, as well as the “relationships among tasks and between tasks and milestones” [Paragraph 14].

Applicant argues that PMI (referred to as PMBOK by the Examiner) discusses using a hierarchical structured identifying system, which is different from the claimed step of “preparing a work definition table which stores a work ID serially assigned for each of the works composing the project” because serially assigned numbers will not reflect a hierarchical structure.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner asserts that assigning work IDs based on a hierarchical structure, as argued by Applicant, does not preclude serial assignment of numbers. For example, a single project (1) may be defined as having subproject (2) that has a task (3) that has subtasks (4) and (5). Similarly, the same project (1) may be defined as having subproject (1.1) having a task (1.1.1) that has subtasks (1.1.1.1) and (1.1.1.2). In the example given above, the assignment of work IDs is based on the hierarchical structure, as well as being serially (i.e., sequential series arrangement) assigned. Thus, the Applicant’s argument is deemed to be unpersuasive.

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims as amended have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Arguments directed towards newly amended subject matter will be addressed in the updated Office Action

below. Specifically, Applicant argues that Stevens does not teach the step of “collecting the man powers and progress degrees of the work IDs”, and further that Stevens discusses using user passwords to determine security access abilities, and not relations between differing projects and documents.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

7. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1, 3, 12 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1, 3, 12 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 based on Supreme Court precedent, and recent Federal Circuit decisions, the Office's guidance to examiners is that a § 101 process must (1) be tied to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780,787-88 (1876).

An example of a method claim that would not qualify as a statutory process would be a claim that recited purely mental steps. Thus, to qualify as a § 101 statutory process, the claim should positively recite the other statutory class (the thing or product)

to which it is tied, for example by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps, or positively recite the subject matter that is being transformed, for example by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state.

Here, applicant's method steps, fail the first prong of the new Federal Circuit decision since they are not tied to another statutory class and can be performed without the use of a particular apparatus. Dependent claims 3, 12 and 15 merely add further details of hierarchical project management recited in claim 1 without including any tie to another statutory category nor any transformation of subject matter into a different state or thing. Thus, claims 1, 3, 12 and 15 are non-statutory since they may be preformed within the human mind.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claims 1-3, 9, 12 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larry Steven's "Simplifying Complex Project Management: Complex Projects at US West Benefit from AutoPlan II Project Management Software" (previously supplied, herein referred to as Stevens), in view of the Project Management Institute's "A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge" (previously supplied, hereinafter referred to as PMBOK) in view of Chiles et al. (US Patent #6,748,582).

As per claim 1, Stevens teaches a method of managing a hierarchically structured project on a computer, comprising the steps of:

(a) defining projects composing the hierarchical structure **(You can input up to 10,000 tasks or milestones, broken down into 128 levels of resources and/or subprojects. The project elements can be organized into 12 levels of work breakdown structures, which provide a hierarchy of tasks)** [Paragraph 10];

(b) selecting works by a user from works which compose an upper project and copying the selected works to define which works compose the project **(You can input up to 10,000 tasks or milestones, broken down into 128 levels of resources and/or subprojects. The project elements can be organized into 12 levels of work breakdown structures, which provide a hierarchy of tasks)** {Thus, the upper



**project (the 12 levels of work breakdown structures) organizes 10,000 tasks or milestones into 128 levels of resources (i.e., subprojects), thereby copying selected subproject contents that are defined based on the works of an upper projects} [Paragraph 10];**

(c) storing progress degree of the work **(AutoPlan II generates reports, such as the percentage of the project (or sub-project) completed)** [Paragraph 18]

(d) defining, in a work relation definition table, relationships among respective work IDs of said project, respective master work IDs, and respective uppermost work IDs, the master work ID being assigned for the same work in the upper project, and the uppermost work ID being assigned for the same work in the uppermost project **(Using the graphical interface [of AutoPlan II], tasks or entire projects can be linked together. Consequently, it is possible to specify that one task can't begin until either one of two other tasks is completed)** [Paragraph 11];

(f) referring to the work relation definition table, collecting attribute values of the work IDs of the same stage and having the same uppermost master work ID, and calculating the attribute values of a compound work using the collected attribute values **(Required resources (people or material), as well as time limitations, can be specified for each task in a project; PERT charts display tasks with information about resources or start and finish dates and show the relationships among tasks and between tasks and milestones; Gantt charts graphically show the planned chronology of a project)** [Paragraphs 11, 14, 15];

(g) storing into a compound Work Breakdown structure (WBS) definition table the uppermost master work ID, a work stage number, the work IDs having the same uppermost master work ID, the projects to which the works belong **(AutoPlan II allowed input of up to 10,000 tasks or milestones, broken down into 128 levels of resources and/or subprojects. The project elements can be organized into 12 levels of work breakdown structures (WBS), which provide a hierarchy of tasks; Using the graphical interface [of AutoPlan II], tasks or entire projects can be linked together. Consequently, it is possible to specify that one task can't begin until either one of two other tasks is completed; PERT charts display tasks with information about resources or start and finish dates and show the relationship among tasks and between tasks and milestones) {the WBS stores the organization of tasks, resources and subprojects and their relationships, the tasks displayed within the same PERT chart are directed towards a common, single project}** [Paragraphs 10, 11, 14] and the calculated progress degree **(The reports [generated by AutoPlan II] most often selected by US West developers are.. percentage of the project (or sub-project) completed)** [Paragraph 18], wherein

(1) when any work ID in a lower stage can be obtained, the uppermost master ID obtaining step, the man powers and progress degrees collecting step, the compound work progress degree calculating step, and the compound WBS definition table storing step for the work IDs of the same stage are repeated for the obtained work ID in the lower stage **{presumably the generation of the**

**WBS structure, PERT and Gantt charts are repeated for each distinct project/subproject}; and**

(i) referring to the compound WBS definition table and displaying the calculated attribute values of said compound work (**PERT charts display tasks with information about resources or start and finish dates and show the relationships among tasks and between tasks and milestones; Gantt charts graphically show the planned chronology of a project; AutoPlan II generates reports, such as the plan-versus-actual dates and costs, and percentage of the project (or sub-project) completed**) [Paragraphs 14, 15, 18].

Although not explicitly taught by Stevens, PMBOK teaches

(c) preparing a work definition table which stores a work ID serially assigned for each of the works composing the project, the project to which the work belongs, the upper work ID of the work (**Each item in the WBS is generally assigned a unique identifier; these identifiers can provide a structure for a hierarchical summation of costs and resources**) [Section 5.3.3.1, page 60], manpower for the work (**The output of the resource planning process is a description of what types of resources are required and in what quantities for each element at the lowest level of the WBS. Resource requirements for higher levels within the WBS can be calculated based on the lower level values; Inputs to Cost Estimating include Resource requirements, Resource rates, Activity duration estimates**) [Section 7.1.3.1, page 86, Section 7.2.1, page 87]; and

(e) referring to the work definition table, and collecting the work IDs of a same stage from the work IDs in the projects selected by the user;

(f) collecting attribute values of the work IDs having the same uppermost master work ID from the work IDs of the same stage, and calculating the attribute values of a compound work using the collected attribute values **(The project schedule may be presented using Project network diagrams with date information added. These charts usually show both the project logic and the project's critical path activities. Bar charts, also called Gantt charts, show activity start and end dates, as well as expected durations, and sometimes show dependencies) {thus, identifying the project's critical path activities, and the expected duration of each activity, the time required to complete a (sub)project can be calculated by aggregating the time required to complete each activity comprising the (sub)project}** [Section 6.4.3.1, Pages 77-78].

Both Stevens and PMBOK are directed towards using the Work Breakdown Structure concept in project management. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Stevens to include the step of assigning an ID code to each work of a project, along with attribute values of each of said works to calculate attribute values of a compound work, and storing manpower for the work, because doing so enhances the teachings of Stevens by providing a uniform structure for cost control and reporting in estimating and accounting for the costs of works of a project, providing a basis in comparing the cost of

Art Unit: 3623

similar work in different projects or at different locations, or to be used as a benchmark when estimating the incurred costs of similar projects, and also to derive the total costs/time requirements of a compound work by cumulatively adding the costs/time requirements of the components that make up said compound work in light of available and required resources including manpower, to be used in project/resource/cost management and planning when developing project cost budgets baseline estimates to measure and monitor timely and efficient execution of the project, including cost performance, as is a goal of PMBOK [Sections 7.3.2.1-7.3.3.1, page 90].

The combined teachings of Stevens and PMBOK do not explicitly teach:

(i) calculating the progress degree of the compound work further includes the substeps of:

(1) multiplying the man power by the progress degree for the works of the same stage and having the same uppermost master work ID and summing the multiplication results to obtain a work amount of the compound work; and

(2) dividing the obtained work amount by a sum of the manpower for the works of the same stage and having the same uppermost master work ID to obtain the progress degree of the compound work.

However, Official Notice that providing an aggregate measure for a plurality of related measures (i.e., subtasks belonging to the same task/project, different measures/metrics used in evaluation) is a concept that is old and well known in the art.

Similarly, Official Notice is taken that the use of arithmetic to yield total (aggregate/composite) or average values is notoriously old and well known in the art.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that applying the technique of providing aggregate measures, and applying arithmetic to derive average and total quantities would have yielded predictable results and resulted in an improved system. It would have been recognized that applying the techniques of providing aggregate measures and applying arithmetic to derive average and total quantities to the combined teachings of Stevens and PMBOK would have yielded predictable results because the level of ordinary skill in the art demonstrated by the references applied shows the ability to compute the percentage of the project completed, as stated by Stevens [Paragraph 18]. Further, applying the technique of providing aggregate measures, and applying arithmetic to derive average and total quantities to the combined teachings of Stevens and PMBOK would have been recognized by those of ordinary skill in the art as resulting in an improved system that would further enhance the project completion percentage reports of Stevens by summarizing the quantifiable progress made in a single project (or subproject) by summing up the progress of all tasks (or subtasks) related to said project (or subproject).

The combined teachings of Stevens and PMBOK do not explicitly teach the step of:

(h) comparing each record of the compound WBS definition table with a condition specified for the progress degree of the compound work and deleting the record which does not satisfy the condition

However, Chiles et al. teaches a project management system that filters out (i.e., deleting) tasks that do not satisfy a specific condition **(Tasks can be filtered so that only tasks meeting specified criteria, e.g., unfinished tasks, appear in the task list window 400. Filtering allows the developer to focus attention on particular tasks of interest. Tasks can be filtered on other criteria, such as category and file... In addition, the tasks can be sorted on the filtering criteria..... As task contributors add more items to the task list, the newly added items are sorted into the current display of task items, provided that they satisfy the current filtering criteria. If the current filtering criteria are not satisfied, a message box appears to indicate that the newly added task will not appear in the list based on the current filtering criteria... the developer can delete tasks or check them to mark them as complete... For some task contributors, however, checking a task as done is equivalent to deleting it)** [Column 9, line 45 – Column 10, line 24].

Both Stevens and PMBOK are directed towards project management. Similarly, Chiles et al. is directed towards task management for a project. Therefore, Stevens, PMBOK and Chiles et al. are deemed to be analogous references in the endeavor of managing the tasks of a project. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

Art Unit: 3623

skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the combined teachings of Stevens and PMBOK to filter and delete works whose progress degree is 0% or 100%, because tracking only the progress of work currently being performed streamlines the information provided in the Gantt, PERT, milestone charts and critical path activity charts taught by PMBOK and Stevens, enabling greater comprehensive of overall progress of current activities.

As per claim 3, Stevens teaches a project management method as claimed in claim 1 further comprising the steps of:

- (a) setting a relation between the project and other accessible project **(PERT charts display tasks with information about resources or start and finish dates and show the relationships among tasks and between tasks and milestones) {where the “tasks” are distinct subprojects of a common project}** [Paragraph 14] and a relation between the project and an accessible document **(The first step in using AutoPlan II... is to create the project chart. The project leader, with help from members of the team, uses the graphical interface to specify the needed resources, tasks, and time constraints; Project administrators, testers, configuration managers, and release managers all do a portion of the work.... Now that the program is easily accessible from anyone’s workstation, it’s much less difficult for team members to enter project data)** [Paragraphs 13, 19]; and
- (b) displaying information of the other project and the document, which are set accessible for a user belonging to the project **(The reports can be displayed in**



**tabular or graphical format; Langan set up passwords by user identification, specifying which users can make changes and which can merely create reports and view the project charts) [Paragraphs 18, 20].**

Claim 9 recites limitations substantially similar to those already addressed by the rejection of claim 1 above; therefore, the same rejection applies.

As per claim 12, although not explicitly taught by Stevens, PMBOK teaches a project management method as claimed in claim 1, wherein a document is registered for each of the works **(In the Activity Definition process in developing the project time schedule, the WBS is used as an input, and as an output, an activity list is produced that includes all activities that will be performed on the project, including descriptions of each activity)** [Sections 6.1.1.1, 6.1.3.1 Pages 67-68] and the method further comprises the step of collecting document registration information of the work having the same uppermost work ID **(Other “breakdown” structures used to present project information include Organizational breakdown structure (OBS), which is used to show which work components have been assigned to which organizational units, and Resource breakdown structure (RBS), which is a variation of the OBS and is typically used when work components are assigned to individuals)** [Section 5.3.3.1, Page 61].

Both Stevens and PMBOK are directed towards using the Work Breakdown Structure concept in project management. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Stevens to include the step of registering a document and document registration information for all the works of a project, because doing so enhances the teachings of Stevens by establishing the resources and person(s) responsible/needed for each work component, further providing accountability for cost, performance, and adherence to schedules.

Claim 14 recites limitations already addressed by the rejection of claim 12 above; therefore, the same rejection applies.

As per claim 15, although not explicitly taught by Stevens or PMBOK, Chiles et al. teaches a project management system as claimed in claim 1, wherein when the condition specified for the progress degree is "work is in progress", the record of the uppermost master work ID which progress degree is 0% or 100% is deleted from the compound WBS definition table **(Tasks can be filtered so that only tasks meeting specified criteria, e.g., unfinished tasks, appear in the task list window 400. Filtering allows the developer to focus attention on particular tasks of interest. Tasks can be filtered on other criteria, such as category and file... In addition, the tasks can be sorted on the filtering criteria..... As task contributors add more items to the task list, the newly added items are sorted into the current display of task items, provided that they satisfy the current filtering criteria. If the current**

**filtering criteria are not satisfied, a message box appears to indicate that the newly added task will not appear in the list based on the current filtering criteria... the developer can delete tasks or check them to mark them as complete... For some task contributors, however, checking a task as done is equivalent to deleting it)** [Column 9, line 45 – Column 10, line 24].

Both Stevens and PMBOK are directed towards project management. Similarly, Chiles et al. is directed towards task management for a project. Therefore, Stevens, PMBOK and Chiles et al. are deemed to be analogous references in the endeavor of managing the tasks of a project. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the combined teachings of Stevens and PMBOK to filter and delete works whose progress degree is 0% or 100%, because tracking only the progress of work currently being performed streamlines the information provided in the Gantt, PERT, milestone charts and critical path activity charts taught by PMBOK and Stevens, enabling greater comprehensive of overall progress of current activities.

Claim 16 recites limitations already addressed by the rejection of claim 15 above; therefore, the same rejection applies.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PETER CHOI whose telephone number is (571)272-6971. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Beth Van Doren can be reached on (571) 272-6737. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

July 3, 2008

/P. C./  
Examiner, Art Unit 3623  
/Jonathan G. Sterrett/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3623